

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,297	10/02/2001	Sean S. Chen	NSC-P05052	9656
7:	590 03/09/2004		EXAM	INER
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			CUNNINGHAM, TERRY D	
Third Floor Two North Market Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Jose, CA 95113			2816	
			DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/970,297	CHEN, SEAN S.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Terry D. Cunningham	2816			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SH THE - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the country of the countr	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a)□		action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 4) Claim(s) 1-4,6-8,11-13,15-21 and 23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-8,11-13,15-21 and 23 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2001 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction to oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment 1) Notic 2) Notic	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	(PTO-413)			
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		ite atent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09 February 2004 has been entered.

Summary of changes in this action

- I. The objection to the specification has been overcome responsive to the amendment thereto.
- II. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome responsive the claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-13, 15-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadanka et al. (USPN 5,621,308) in view of newly cited art to Mietus (USPN 5,666,046). Kadanka et al. disclose, in Fig. 2, a circuit comprising: "a band-gap reference unit (73)"; "a buffer circuit (54)"; and "a voltage pull-up device (70)", wherein the "voltage pull-up device" has a "transistors (48)". Kadanka et al. does not expressly disclose that transistor 46 has a "less than 1.0 V_{BE}". However, it is notoriously well known, as expressly taught by Mietus

Application/Control Number: 09/970,297

Art Unit: 2816

(e.g., see Col. 1, lines 56-67), to use a voltage of 0.7 volts for the expect advantage of using a

lower supply voltage (e.g., 0.8 volts). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in

the art to manufacture transistor 48 with "less than 1.0 V_{BE}" for the expected advantage allowing

for a lower supply voltage.

Examiner has fully considered Applicant's remarks for the above rejection and has not

found them to be persuasive. Contrary to Applicant's remarks, the "voltage pull-up device" 70 is

connected to node at the gate of 54. This node is a point "between the "band-gap unit" 73 and

the "buffer circuit" 54. Thus, it would be more than reasonable to consider the "voltage pull-up

device" as being "coupled between said band-gap unit and said buffer circuit".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Terry Cunningham whose telephone number is 571-272-1742.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Timothy P. Callahan can be reached on 571-272-1740. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

TC March 4, 2004 Terry D. Cunningha Primary Examiner Page 3

Art Unit 2816